

~~SECRET~~  
CONFIDENTIAL

24 Jan 57

## LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

### 1. GENERAL STATEMENT

a. The Committee on Language Development was instructed to complete all the action papers required to activate the Language Development Program by 1 February 1957.

b. The completed work of the Committee is represented by items 3, 4, and 5 of the Agenda for this meeting. There remains to be completed, before the Program can be launched, one Notice,   Schedule of Awards and Qualification Procedures. The Committee requires guidance from the Council before it can proceed with the final drafting of the remaining Notice in view of its findings on estimated costs of the Program to the Agency, and its disagreement on two major points.

### 2. FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON COSTS OF AWARDS

a. Charts #1 through 4, dated 24 January 1957, summarize the cost data developed and considered by the Committee.

(1) Chart #1, Schedule of Awards, lists the values of achievement and maintenance awards for the types and levels of proficiency in three language groupings. Cost estimates on all charts are based on these amounts.

(2) Chart #2, Estimated Annual Total Costs of the Language Development Program for the First five year period, includes costs of training as well as the combined costs of achievement and maintenance awards. The four totals shown on the chart for the fifth year indicate the effect on total costs of alternative restrictions on maintenance awards.

(3) Chart #3, Annual Estimated Costs of Maintenance Awards (based on the fifth year estimate), illustrates the values of maintenance awards for various types and levels of proficiency by language group. It was prepared for use in arriving at a formula for placing restrictions on maintenance awards.

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1

25X1A

COG	REV	DATE	BY	TYPE	30
ORIG	CLASS	11	OP1	REV	CLASS
ORIG	CLASS	5	PAGES	2010	AUTH: HR 10-2
JUST	22	NEXT	REV	2010	

## CONFIDENTIAL

(4) Chart #4, Estimated Annual Costs of Awards for the First Five Years of the Program, shows the relative amounts of achievement and maintenance awards for various categories of candidates.

b. After consideration of these data, the Committee concluded that:

(1) The amounts and the ratios of awards in Chart #1 are adequate for purposes of the Program. It is possible, at these levels of award, for an individual to earn awards in the average amount of \$215.00 per year in Group I languages to \$567.00 per year for Group III languages over a 25 year period, provided that no limitations are placed upon maintenance awards.

(2) The ratio of maintenance award costs to total award costs is disproportionate to the Agency but not to the individual. Chart #4 shows maintenance costs ranging between 85% and 95% of total award costs.

(3) A line should be drawn cutting off maintenance awards at some point, but the Committee could not agree on where to draw it. In this respect the Committee considered the following alternatives:

(a) That maintenance awards should not now be authorized except for the intermediate and high levels of comprehensive and specialized proficiency in Group III languages only. (If this proposal were adopted, it would save an estimated \$1,606,875.00. See Total<sup>4</sup>/Chart #2 for effect on total cost of Program.)

(b) That maintenance awards should be authorized only for intermediate and high levels of comprehensive and specialized proficiency in Group II and Group III languages. (If this proposal were adopted, it would save an estimated \$1,163,775. See Total<sup>3</sup>/Chart #2 for effect on total cost of Program.)

(c) That maintenance awards should be authorized at present only for those who have qualified for an achievement award under the Program, unless the individual is already at the highest proficiency level in a Group II or III language and is eligible for award, except that no maintenance awards should be authorized for elementary levels of proficiency in any language group. (The effect of this proposal on costs would be to postpone payment of maintenance awards on any scale comparable to that reflected on the charts, except for

## CONFIDENTIAL

those in directed training in full time intensive courses. It would also provide more time to consider all of the complicating factors surrounding the principle of maintenance awards and to gain experience with the Program. It would also have the effect of stimulating those now skilled in languages to increase levels of proficiency.)

### 3. DISAGREEMENTS IN THE COMMITTEE

a. Maintenance Awards. The Committee failed to agree on either of the three proposals cited above dealing with maintenance awards. It believes that guidance from the Council is the only recourse in resolving this issue.

b. Notice

(1) The Committee reached the unanimous conclusion that two criteria should govern the designation and classification of languages for award purposes, namely: Agency need, and, relative difficulty of the language. Accordingly, and after consultation with various components within the Agency, forty languages were designated in three groups, each with a different monetary value, as being those which are awardable under the provisions of the Language Development Program for the foreseeable future. The Notice further provides for the addition, deletion or shifting of languages from one group to another from time to time as Agency needs may indicate.

(2) The Committee was divided (4 to 1) on the manner in which the two criteria (viz. Agency need, and relative difficulty of the language) should apply to the designation of any given language as being awardable, or non-awardable at any time.

(a) The majority view holds that Agency need, which is a variable factor, may make it advisable, from time to time, to place, for example, one or more less difficult languages in a language group for which higher awards are authorized, in order to encourage the voluntary study of such languages.

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

Conversely, it may also be advisable, following the same reasoning, to shift a more difficult language to a group for which lower awards are authorized, in order to decrease the numbers who might undertake its study, without removing it from the awardable list. In its present draft, [ ] lists Greek 25X1A which on the basis of relative difficulty alone properly belongs in Group II, in Group I.

(b) The minority view, represented by the DD/S member, who wished his dissent to become a matter of official record, is that if a language is awardable at all, it should command 25X1A an award commensurate with its relative difficulty. It is his view that if Greek is awardable at all it should appear in [ ] in language Group II not in Group I. While he sponsors the criterion of Agency need, he believes that the removal from, or, addition to the lists of awardable languages is the only appropriate and equitable way to reflect that need since the Language Development Program is based upon award for effort, and it takes a greater effort on the part of the individual to acquire a given level of proficiency in a more difficult language than it does in a simpler language. He further believes that rather than devalue a language, to decrease the numbers who might undertake its study, it is better to remove it from the list of awardable languages entirely and satisfy limited Agency requirements by means of directed rather than voluntary language training.

(3) [ ] therefore, while placed on the Agenda of the CIA Career Council, does not represent the unanimous view of the Committee on Language Development.

#### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the CIA Career Council:

a. Authorize the granting of maintenance awards in the intermediate and advanced levels of comprehensive and specialized proficiency only to those who have earned an achievement award in the language (unless they are at the highest level of proficiency) in Group II and Group III languages, only. [ ] can then be drafted accordingly and prepared for publication by 1 February 1957.

*value of delay*

SECRET

**SECRET**

b. Authorize the publication of [redacted] ~~deleting Creek from~~ 25X1A  
~~the list for the time being.~~ [redacted] as been designed for easy 25X1A  
and frequent amendment and revision at any time.

c. Approve items 3, 4 and 5 on the Agenda.

MATTHEW BAIRD  
Director of Training

**SECRET**